UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

5:12-CV-00282-F

SMITHFIELD BUSINESS PARK, LLC)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
SLR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION)
Defendant,)) SLR INTERNATIONAL) CORPORATION'S MEMORANDUM IN
	 SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A REPLY TO PLAINTIFF SMITHFIELD BUSINESS PARK, LLC'S
SLR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION) AND THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT) INDUSTRIAL REALTY GROUP, LLC'S
Third-Party Plaintiff) MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION) TO MOTION TO COMPEL
VS.)
MASSOUD TABRIZI, INDUSTRIAL REALTY GROUP, LLC AND SESTECH)
ENVIRONMENTAL, LP)
Third-Party Defendants)))
	•

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(d), Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff, SLR International Corporation ("SLR") files its memorandum in support of its Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Smithfield Business Park, LLC's ("Smithfield") and Third-Party Defendant Industrial Realty Group, LLC's ("IRG") Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel (the "Reply"). 1

¹ See Exhibit "A", SLR's Reply, attached to SLR's Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Plaintiff Smithfield Business Park, LLC's and Third-Party Defendant Industrial Realty Group, LLC's Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel.

I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

- SLR has met its burden in demonstrating good cause for the granting of this Motion for Leave. IRG's and Smithfield's Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel the Deposition of Stuart Lichter contains flawed arguments raised for the first time. In the interests of fairness and justice, SLR should be afforded the opportunity to present the Court with the fullest and most factual picture upon which the Court can adjudicate this matter.
- Therefore, this Court should grant SLR's Motion for Leave to file a Reply to Plaintiff Smithfield's and Third-Party Defendant IRG's Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel.

II. ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES

This matter is before the Court for determination of SLR's Motion to Compel the Deposition of Stuart Lichter (the "Motion"). SLR filed its Motion on January 20, 2014, and Memorandum in support of its Motion on January 31, 2014. Smithfield and IRG filed their Memorandum in Opposition to SLR's Motion (the "Memorandum") on February 4, 2014. SLR seeks leave of this Court to file its Reply to Smithfield's and IRG's Memorandum to address new arguments raised for the first time.

While the Local Rules of this Court do not generally contemplate reply briefs in discovery disputes, this Court has granted motions for leave to file reply briefs in discovery disputes upon a showing of good cause.² In their Memorandum, Smithfield and IRG argue that SLR failed to certify that counsel has in good faith attempted to resolve the dispute without this Court's intervention, SLR's Motion is premature, the Motion fails to meet the procedural requirements set forth in Local Rule 7.1(d), and the Motion is moot. SLR has not had an

² SMD Software, Inc. v. EMove, Inc., 5:08-CV-403-FL, 2011 WL 2491208, at *4, fn. 3 (E.D.N.C. June 22, 2011).

opportunity to address why these arguments are flawed and inapplicable here. In fairness, SLR requests an opportunity to reply to Smithfield's and IRG's arguments in order to present the fullest and most complete factual picture upon which the Court can evaluate the parties' arguments, particularly since it is SLR seeking to compel the discovery. Therefore, SLR's Reply is appropriate, and it should be permitted to respond to Smithfield's and IRG's arguments raised Moreover, allowing SLR to file a Reply to Smithfield's and IRG's for the first time. Memorandum: (1) will not unduly burden this Court, (2) will assure the most appropriate resolution of this matter, and (3) will serve the interests of justice by allowing all parties a full and fair opportunity to speak to the merits of their respective positions.

FOR THESE REASONS, SLR's Motion for Leave to file its Reply to Smithfield's and IRG's Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel should be granted.

This 7th day of February, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

ZIMMERMAN, AXELRAD, MEYER, STERN & WISE, P.C.

/s/ Brian W. Zimmerman By:

> Brian W. Zimmerman State Bar No. 00788746

bzimmerman@zimmerlaw.com

Leslie K. Hillendahl State Bar No. 24036778 lhillendahl@zimmerlaw.com 3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1300

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: 713-552-1234

Facsimile: 713-963-0859

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

By: /s/ Heather Adams

Heather B. Adams NC State Bar No. 25239 Richard A. McAvoy NC State Bar No. 43043 Alston & Bird, LLP

4721 Emperor Blvd., Suite 400

Durham, NC 27518

Heather.Adams@alston.com Rich.mcavoy@alston.com Phone: (919) 862-2200

Fax: (919) 862-2260

Local Civil Rule 83.1 Counsel

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT/COUNTER-PLAINTIFF, SLR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on February 7, 2014, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been sent to the following attorneys of record, pursuant to Rule 5b, FED.R.CIV.P.:

Luther D. Starling, Jr. <u>Via ECF</u>

James C. Williams

Daughtry, Woodard, Lawrence & Starling

Post Office Drawer 1960 Smithfield, NC 27577

James M. Weiss <u>Via ECF</u>

P. O. Box 33550

Raleigh, NC 27636

Joshua Anderson <u>Via ECF</u>

1301 McKinney, Ste. 2700 Houston, TX 77010-3089

Thomas S. Babel *Via ECF*

Jeremy M. Wilson Ward and Smith, P.A. Post Office Box 7068

Wilmington, NC 28406-7068

/s/ Brian W. Zimmerman
Brian W. Zimmerman